

**Ford Site Planning Task Force**  
**March 5, 2007**  
**Lumen Christi Catholic Church**

**Meeting #3 Summary**

**Ford Site Planning Task Force members present:** Carole Faricy, Co-Chair, William Klein, Co-Chair, Peter Armstrong, Shawn Bartsh, James Bricher, Richard Broderick, Ronnie Brooks, Anthony Desnick, David Drach, Terri Dooher Fleming, Charles Hathaway, Deborah Karasov, Angela Kline, Gary Marx, Lance Neckar, Dennis Rosemark, Matthew Schuerger, Stuart Simek, Bruce Valen, Stephanie Warne, Ellen Watters, Pamela Wheelock, Sue (representing Dave Sellergren); **Absent:** Scott Malcolm, Morgan Tamsky

**City Staff, others agency reps or consultants present:** Cecile Bedor (PED), Larry Soderholm (PED), Merritt Clapp-Smith (PED), Luis Pereira (PED), Nancy Homans (Mayor's office), Ward 3 Councilmember Pat Harris, John Marshall (Ward 3), Bill Vitek and Deana Swetlik (EDAW), Bob Close and Bruce Jacobson (Close Landscape Architects), Tom Lincoln (URS), Monte Hilleman (Port Authority), Gayle Summers (Highland District Council), Anne Carroll (Capstone), Tamara Downs Schwei (Capstone), Tim Dykstal (Capstone), Jake Granholm (Capstone), Britta Stein (Capstone).

**Others Attending (based on meeting sign-in sheet):** Jennifer Kent (Lunds), Tim Nelson (Pioneer Press), Marisa Helms (MPR), Mark Harstad (Chamber of Commerce), Dave Pinto, Eric Angell, David Daley, Ned Rukavina, Gary Fischbach, Lynn Hinkle, Charles Nelson, Vic Ward

Meeting called to order by co-chair Carole Faricy at 6:34 PM. Co-chair Klein noted a public citizen's request to correct the Meeting #2 Summary to change the wording on page 3 under the Stakeholder discussion from "A current temporary Ford employee in the audience *claimed to live* nearby..." to "A current temporary Ford employee in the audience *indicated that she lived* nearby..." Klein asked if there were any other requested changes to the Meeting Summary. Hearing none, the revised Summary was approved unanimously by the Task Force (TF).

Faricy noted that 3 public meetings would allow the public to give their comments, the first scheduled for March 20, from 6:30-8:30 PM (to be broadcast on SPNN, channel 15). Faricy noted that Ford wanted to clarify that their River-adjacent parcels are not to be included in the planning process discussion. Two TF members asked if it was appropriate for Ford to make that decision, or if it was really up to the City and/or TF to decide which properties to include in the planning. Cecile Bedor, Director of PED, stated that the River property would be considered as an adjacent property, similar to other surrounding properties.

Consultants Bill Vitek and Deana Swetlik gave an overview of the evening's agenda. Vitek clarified that the River property was part of the TF's concern, even if not within the official scope of redevelopment. He stated that EDAW would lead the consultant team, with Deana Swetlik as project manager, and Bob Close as local project manager (with Bruce Jacobsen as an additional local contact). Further on in the TF process, a Developers Panel would evaluate the alternative development scenarios as a "market reality check," and the Port Authority would be contracting a market consultant within two weeks. Ford is lining up a consultant for a phase I environmental assessment.

Swetlik emphasized this TF's charge (through June) is to help develop a *range* of alternative development scenarios, proceeding later into phase two, to undergo a fiscal impact/AUAR analysis; and a final alternative would be selected (recommended) *after* the phase two analysis, in April 2008. Swetlik stated that this evening's meeting would establish initial goals/guiding principles, and by next meeting (3/19) the consultant team would present their initial analysis of the site, and the TF would work toward agreement on a vision statement. The 3/20 public meeting would do the same in less

detail, and leave the majority of the time for public discussion of concerns, opportunities, etc. The 4/16 meeting would then be a design charrette, and the 5/7 meeting would review initial concepts for the 3-5 alternative development scenarios. The 5/21 meeting would be another charrette to refine these scenarios, and at the 6/4 meeting, the consultant would present and discuss these refined scenarios. The 6/18 meeting would consist of a final presentation of the scenarios, and a discussion of next steps. Vitek reiterated that it would be an iterative process, akin to “peeling an onion”, resulting in the 3-5 scenarios at the core of the onion.

The TF had two sets of questions/comments on schedule/timeline, etc.:

- Several TF members asked about the timeline allotted for developing the alternative scenarios. Swetlik responded that the 4/16 meeting would include brainstorming, bound by the established goals/objectives; in general, there would be time for the creation, review, and refinement of the scenarios between April and June (5 TF meetings). During this process, two developer panels would help the TF review the scenarios, and the key stakeholders, as approved by the TF, would be interviewed separately by the consultants.
- Several TF members asked about the timing of the market analysis of the alternative scenarios. One member questioned if the developer panels would be too late in the process, or if their ideas might be missed by the consultant team. Swetlik answered that they would organize and coordinate with the Port Authority market consultant to get the necessary market analysis, hopefully within 3-4 weeks. The developer panels would be presented with a wider range of scenarios to begin with (7-9), enough to react to, and eventually get to the 3-5 scenarios envisioned. A TF member responded that the Principles and Vision Statements would need to be based in market reality.

Vitek and Swetlik reviewed the site context, showing its size in relationship to downtown Saint Paul and other sites in the region. Next, they presented a summary of the issues brainstormed by the TF at the last meeting, including the categories of access/services, development, economics, natural resources, participatory planning, public amenities, sustainability, views/vistas. The TF commented that it should include the existing site resources/assets to retain, like the training center, and make sure that the site’s redevelopment draws upon local competitive advantage and leverages private resources, as well as represents a balance between city and local interests.

Vitek and Swetlik subsequently proposed the 15 key stakeholders for this site with whom the consultants will hold one-on-one stakeholder interviews during phase one of the process. A TF member said that the federal government or key large infrastructure organizations must be consulted, including the MAC and Met Council. Several other TF members commented on the need to include Highland residents on this priority stakeholder list, distinguishing them from the general public, whether by interviews, surveys, etc. The consultants replied that the public meetings could cover this, but others suggested that District 15 might be able to capture such input, and this would be explored over the next week. Other comments included a possibility of having a high tech consortium on the site, or including as additional stakeholders St. Paul Public Schools, area private schools, service/institutions that provide social services, and the City of Minneapolis/Longfellow neighborhood. City staff is engaging the MAC and Met Council in the Technical Advisory Group, and will provide information to the latter.

Next, Ms. Swetlik gave examples of a Vision Statement, something that the TF would need to establish for the Ford project, in addition to goals/guiding principles and objectives. She defined a vision statement as “a short statement that is utilized to guide the ultimate development of a project/place: often answering very broadly the question, ‘What do we want this place to be?’” “Goals” for the project would consist of planning process categories utilized to help organize and focus ideas, and objectives are strategies to meet such goals. The TF was given the homework of preparing a vision statement and sending it to Merritt Clapp-Smith, City project manager, by Monday 3/12.

The TF was divided into 4 small groups to discuss possible goals and objectives for the Ford site. The consultants stated that goals and objectives are touchstones to always revisit when evaluating each of the alternative development scenarios considered. Six goal planning categories proposed by the consultants included Land Carrying Capacity, Economic Feasibility, Open Space, Connectivity, Sustainability, and Policy. Some responses from the TF included:

- “Sustainability” can have different meanings, so the TF must define it explicitly
- The possibility that the impacts on existing environment systems and natural resources could be overlooked on the consultant-proposed list. As such, environmental preservation and minimization of impact should be added as a goal. Cecile Bedor, PED director, stated that the administration’s goal is low emissions for the site.
- That perhaps “Sustainability” is an overarching issue, not a single category
- The question of whether each goal had a time horizon: The consultants said the goals should be broad expectations for the project over a long period
- That instead of “Open Space,” maybe the category should be “Community Amenities”; open space might fit better under “Connectivity”
- The consultants stated that the “Land Carrying Capacity” refers to the heights and density that the area’s neighbors are willing to allow on the site (The body of the draft Highland District Council plan states that apartments/condos should be limited to 3 stories)

The small groups reconvened as a large group, and the Capstone students summarized each group’s ideas for the entire group. The consultants will summarize these notes to report back to the Task Force.

The meeting adjourned at 8:29 PM.